

DIALOGUES

BETWEEN A

Lover of PEACE, and a Lover of TRUTH,

Under the Denominations of

Philereene and Philalethe,

Concerning the

Differences, at this time, between the
POPE, the FRENCH KING and his
CLERGY.

PART I.

IMPRIMATUR,

Liber cui Titulus*, [*Dialogues between Philérène and Philalethe.*]

March 27.
1688.

GVIL. NEEDHAM, R. R. in Christo
P. ac D. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. a Sacr.
Domest.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Joseph Watts*, at the *Angel* in *St. Paul's*
Church-yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

DIALOQUE

PAR

LE

LE

LE

LE

LE

LE

LE

ADVICE TO THE READER.

IT is above a year since this little Treatise hath been fit for the Press; and if the Author had pleased he needed not have delayed the Publishing of it so long; but as he did not undertake it with that design, so he did not consent to it, but at the solicitation of a judicious and learned Friend, for whose Advice he had the same regard, as for his Commands.

You will not find in these Discourses that delicacy of Expression, and that justness of Speech which are the ornament and beauty of the greatest part of the works of this Age: For besides that the stile of Dialogues ought to be plain and easie, the Author never made any account of that high-raised and lofty Eloquence, which, as a Learned Man of our Age says, * seduces men into error by its counterfeited splendor. He always thought that solid Eloquence consisted in Matter, and not in Words; and that it were incomparably better for a Man to say a great deal in few words, † than little or nothing at all in a great many. He ever esteemed the Conciseness of Cicero before the Copiousness of Demosthenes; and always held this maxim of the Fathers concerning Eloquence in Holy things, That the Eloquence of those who make Religion their Subject, ought to consist in the weight of their Matter, and of their Reason; and that they ought to explain themselves after an easie manner, that all sorts of people might understand them. When we speak of God, says St. Cyprian, || the Discourse we make use of to prove the Faith, ought not to depend upon the strength of Eloquence, but of Matter. The Church, says St. Athanasius, ∴ is not a School of Sophisters ∴

* Monsieur Nicole dans l'art de penser.

† Vid. Plutar. in Phoc.

|| Cypr. ad Do-
natum.

Atha. Orat.
nor de semente.

* *Aug. lib. 4. de doc. Christ. c. 15. &c.* nor of Orators. *And the famous St. Augustin, * tho he were*

one of the most eloquent of his time, freely declares, That a Man were better be reprov'd by the Gramarians, than not understood of the people; and that a Preacher of the Gospel ought chiefly to endeavour to make himself to be understood and heard with desire, and with a spirit of submission, of his Auditory; which he may better arrive to by the Piety of his Prayers, than by the Artifice of his Discourse. If you take good heed, you shall find that false Teachers have always hid themselves under the vail

† *Vid. I Cor. 2. of false Eloquence †, and that it is out of this Golden Cup that they*
Cor. II. 6, &c. have made men drink the mortal Poyson of Error; whereas the Apostles

|| *Vid. Irenæ. lib. I. Advers. Hæres. valent. Orig. lib. II. de principiis, & lib. 4. 5. contra Celsum.* *and all Orthodox Teachers || taking a contrary way, made it their glory to use a great simplicity of speech, wanting that which St. Paul calls the enticing words of mens wisdom. The Author hath followed these noble and glorious methods, and without putting himself to the trouble of ending his Periods in their just measure (keeping however to the purity of the language, as much as possibly he could) he hath applied himself chiefly to the weight and force of his Reasons. You will find in him, I hope, sufficient to perswade and to convince you, provided you bring with you an easie, peaceable, and wholly unprejudiced mind: This is the spirit that runs throughout this whole work; and it was this spirit that began and finished the design, the Author having not propos'd to himself any other aim than that of animating Christians to the searching out of Peace and Truth, two the greatest happineses that ever men can arrive to.*

Furthermore, If this little Treatise hath the good fortune to please, we may furnish you with some others which the Author hath compos'd at more leasure, and which he hath enriched with some particular observations which he hath made, by Reading the most Ancient and the most Learned Fathers of the Church. Accept however of this, with the same mind that he offereth it to you.

Quod Gloriosus fratres quam subjici & vinci a veritate: superet te veritas volentem nam & invitum ipsa superabit. Aug. in Psalm 57.

DIALOGUES

BETWEEN

PHILERENE and PHILALETHE.

PART I.

The First Dialogue.

NOtwithstanding the Difference between *Philalethe* and *Philerène* as to their Age, they were both of them persons of so great Worth, and their Inclinations were so much alike, that scarce had they seen one another three or four times, but they contracted a very strict Friendship.

As they never were better pleased than when they were together, they oftentimes left their ordinary Employments, for the Satisfaction of seeing one another; and conferring together, as well concerning things which they had Read, as those they had Heard of. In this Design they often went to walk upon a River-side, from whence they could discover one of the finest and richest Countries of all *France*. And as they were both of them men of great Learning, and of a clear Apprehension, they went always home greatly satisfied with their Conversation.

B

They

2
A Dialogue between

They made use of the first fine days which the Spring afforded, to renew their desirable Conversation, which the severity of the Winter had interrupted: And the first time they met, having given Assurances of their mutual Affection, and shewed how glad they were to meet in a place where they might freely discover their most secret Thoughts to each other, *Philérène* spoke thus to his Friend;

Have you not heard talk, my dear *Philalèthe*, of the present Affairs? I mean, of the Deliberation which the Assembly of the Clergy hath taken? I have, answered *Philalèthe*, heard something of it, but I cannot give you a full Account o'nt; if you know it, you will oblige me to tell it me.

Philérène. I need not tell you, my dear Friend, that my Lords the Bishops of *Tournay*, of *Meaux*, of *St. Maloes*, of *Vaur*, of *Châlons*, and of *Aleth*, had been named by the Assembly of the Clergy, to examin the Six Propositions of the *Sorbonne*, presented to the King in 1663. because you know it already. But what perhaps you do not know, is, That the Clergy did Assemble the 17th. of the last Month, after the usual manner, and took the Report of these Prelates. My Lord Bishop of *Tournay*, who was Head of the Commission, began the Report, and delivered himself very Learnedly upon this Occasion. The next day in the Evening the other Commissioners were heard; and they discoursed upon this Subject with great Learning. The 19th. in the Morning they spoke every man in his turn upon the Subject of their Commission; and at Night, the Company being re-assembled, they, by a general Consent, approved of a Declaration, which contains these following Propositions.

The First is, That neither the Pope, nor the Church it self, hath any Power, directly nor indirectly, over the Temporality of Kings; That they cannot be deposed; and that their Subjects cannot be absolved from their Oaths of Allegiance to them upon any account whatsoever.

The Second is, That the Council is above the Pope, according to the Doctrine established in the 14th. Session of the Council.

Philérène and Philalethe.

Council of *Constance*; which the Assembly declares to have had the full Power and Approbation of the Church.

The Third is, That the Use of the Pope's Power ought to be limited by the Canons, and that he can do nothing to the Prejudice of the Ancient Customs and Liberties of the *Gallieane* Church.

The Fourth is, That the Pope hath the Chief or Principal Authority in things which concern the Faith; but so, that his Decisions are not certain without the Churches Consent.

The Assembly ordered at the same time, That this Declaration should be written in *Latine*, and sent to all the Prelates of *France*, to be Signed by them; and that the King should be petitioned to make an Edict for the Execution of it throughout the whole Kingdom.

Philalethe. This is *Brave*, and looks like the Apostolical Vigour and Heroick Courage of our Ancient Prelates.

Philér. This is not all: These Lords Commissioners were dispatched away to the King; and having given an exact Account of the Behaviour of the Clergy, they demanded an Edict in the Kings Name, for the Execution of their Declaration. His Majesty granted them the Edict, which was made as followeth.

And by this Edict the King ordains, That this Declaration shall be Registred in all the Courts of Parliament of the Kingdom, and in all the Faculties of Divinity and of the Canon-Law: And his Majesty doth Prohibit, under grievous Penalties, even Foreigners within his own Kingdom, and all, as well Seculars as Regulars, to teach any thing contrary to what is contained in this Declaration.

This Edict hath been executed. The Parliament of *Paris* hath Registred this Declaration of the Clergy with that Zeal and Readiness that cannot be too much commended, and which all other Parliaments of the Kingdom ought to imitate.

Phila. It cannot be denied but that our Prince is incomparable in all his Actions; that *France* never saw upon the Throne a Monarch of so High a Character, and of so great a Power; that he maintains most worthily upon all occasions, the Glorious Title of *Lewis the Great*, which his Heroick Acti-

A Dialogue between

ons have acquired him. And that the Parliament of *Paris* hath done well to express the great Zeal which they have always had for the Rights of the Crown, and for the Liberty of the *Gallican* Church, against the Enterprizes of the Court of *Rome*. You may have read in our Histories what heretofore *Philip the August*, *Philip the Fair*, *Charles the 6th*, *7th*, and *8th*, *Lewis the 9th*, *11th*, and *12th* did: You know also the Conduct of the same Parliament under all these Great Princes, to maintain according to their Will and Pleasure the Rights of the Crown, and the Privileges of the *Gallican* Church. And I believe also, that you have heard of the Decrees which this Honourable House hath sent forth under *Lewis the 13th*. against the Scandalous Books of *Sauterel* and of *Bellarmin*: But we may say without excess, That *Lewis the Great* in this Conjunction, hath shewed more stedfastness and greatness of Mind, in the Opposition which he hath made against the Attempts of the Court of *Rome*, than all his Illustrious Predecessors ever did. And it cannot also be denied, but that the Parliament of *Paris* hath gone on worthily in the Footsteps of their Glorious Ancestors.

Philér. It is not in this single Affair only, that this Honourable House of Parliament have shewed their Zeal to Second the Intentions of his Majesty, and to maintain the Rights of the Crown, and the Privileges of the *Gallican* Church: They have also given notable Proofs of it in the Affair of Father *Bubi* the *Carmelite*.

Phila. I have also heard of a *Thesis* which this Father had maintained the 4th. of *December* last; and it was said, that they had caused him some Trouble about it at *Rome*; but I do not precisely know, what were the Propositions which this Father did maintain.

Philér. If my Memory doth not fail me, I think there were Six: The First of them is, That there are some Ecclesiastical Laws to which the Pope himself is subject. The Second is, That he cannot upon all occasions dispence with the Canons of General Councils. The Third is, That he cannot Depose Kings, nor impose Tributes upon their Estates without their Consent. The Fourth, That Bishops hold their Jurisdiction from God. The Fifth, That the Faculty
of

of Divinity at *Paris*, doth not esteem the Pope to be Infallible. And the Sixth, That the Right of the Regale is neither a Fancy nor an Usurpation. These Propositions greatly stirred up the Pope against this Father, he ordered the Commissary General of the *Carmelites* to declare him deprived of the privileges of his Order, and uncapable of performing any function, either Administration of the Sacraments, or Preaching. This Command was sent to the Superior of the *Carmelites* of the place *Maubert* *, to whom this Commissary General had given advice of the Noise that this Thesis of Father *Bubi* had made at *Rome*, and of the misfortune wherewith the whole Order was threatned. This Father demanded a Copy of the Letter of his Superior, that he might consult his Friends about it, which was granted him; The Affair coming at length to the King's ear, there came forth a Letter under the Seal, to the Superior, forbidding him to execute any Order from *Rome* against Father *Bubi*, without the King's knowledge and consent: Yet notwithstanding this, the Superior caused the Order to be Registered, which he had received from the Commissary General of the *Carmelites* the 18th of *February* last. But the Parliament shewed the same vigour in this Affair as in that of the Declaration of the Clergy; for after many proceedings made at the instance of the Attorney General, the Parliament ordered that the Superior of the *Carmelites* should be admonished for his Disobedience, and expressly forbade the execution of the Order against Father *Felix Bubi*; to which they added, That he should continue in his Function of Divinity Reader, expressly forbidding any person to molest him; and at length they Order that the Commissary General's Letter should be razed out of the Register, and laid aside: And this by order of Parliament, the 14th day of *April* 1682.

* A Street
In *Paris* so
called.

Phila. The Parliament did very bravely in this Affair, and shewed that the same spirit of Zeal and Courage still reigns in that Honourable Assembly.

Philér. But ought not we to fear that this should cause some rupture with the Pope? Into what confusion and disorder might not so unfortunate an accident cast us? † Were we not better to Sacrifice somewhat to the good of our peace, which

‡ *Greg. Naz.*
Orat. 12.

is

is the greatest Legacy that our Saviour left to his Apostles,
 * Joh. 14. 27. * *Pacem meam do vobis?* What is there more precious than
 Union and Concord, since that Jesus Christ gave so great a
 † Joh. 13. 35. Character of it to his Disciples? † *In hoc cognoscent omnes quia
 mei Discipuli estis si dilectionem habueritis ad invicem.* What is
 there more prejudicial than disunion and discord which destroy
 the most flourishing States? *Omne regnum divisum contra se deso-
 labitur & domus divisa contra se non stabit.* Matt. 12. 25.

Phila. I agree with you, that we ought to do our utmost
 to obtain Peace; that we ought to sacrifice our own Interests;
 nay, that for so great a good we ought to relinquish things
 that seem to us of importance. *Ipsium enim nomen pacis amabile,*
 says St. Austin; but you must own too, that we ought to do
 nothing for Peace to the prejudice of Truth; St. Paul joyns
 || Eph. 4. 15. these one with the other, || *Veritatem facientes in Charitate.* And
 God, who calls himself Charity, calls himself also Truth; I
 know also that the Fathers of the Church exhort us greatly
 to avoid Schism as a mortal poison; but a Peace made against
 the interest of Truth, is not a real Peace; and when we cannot
 make it, and maintain it, but at the prejudice of this Truth,
 it were better that a Scandal should arise, than that Truth
 should be abandoned. *Satius est,* says St. Bernard, *ut scandalum
 oriatur quam ut veritas disceratur.*

Philér. How! My dear Philal. Do you think that the Propo-
 sitions of the Clergies Declaration, and of Father Bubi's The-
 sis, contain such essential and such important Truths, that it
 would be a crime not to defend them, tho it were to the dis-
 turbance of the Publick Peace?

Phila. Yes, Dear Sir, I am very well perswaded that all
 these Propositions are founded upon Texts of Scripture, up-
 on the Canons of Councils, and upon the perpetual and con-
 stant Tradition of the Church, principally of the *Gallican*
 Church; and by consequence, I believe that we ought not to
 depart from them any ways, and that we cannot do it without
 danger: But because it will be a matter of long Discourse, I
 shall defer the examining of it to another walk.

The Second Dialogue.

P*Hilaethe* and *Philerène*, who were no less desirous to entertain each other upon the subject whereon they had begun, than to enjoy the fine weather of the Spring, came the next day to the place appointed for their Conversation.

Scarce had they walked a turn or two, talking of indifferent matters, but *Philaethe*, to make good the promise he had made the day before to his dear Friend, began thus: I told you yesterday, says he, that the Propositions contained in the Declaration of my Lords the Bishops, and in the Thesis maintained by Father *Bubi*, are of greater importance than you thought of; and that they contained in them, Truths too evident, and too necessary to be let go for the motives of a deluding Peace. To convince you of it, we will make it the subject of our present Discourse: I believe that the first and chief of these Questions, and which ought to serve as a foundation to all the rest, is that which concerns the Authority of Councils, which hath ever been most venerable among Christians, and which I believe to be of Divine Right, and above the Authority of the Pope: And in this I rely upon the Scripture, and the perpetual and constant Tradition of the Church.

I believe, answered *Philérène*, as you do, That the Authority of Councils is of Divine Right; and no Christian that ever I heard of hath yet disputed it: But I know not whether you can so clearly prove as you hope for, that this Authority of Councils is above that of the Pope, for that many Learned men hold the contrary, and there seems to be nothing in Antiquity decisive upon this matter. The Council of *Constance* was the first that in this case pronounced in favour of Councils; and what that Council declared about it, was not in an absolute sence, but in some certain respects, and for some certain occasions.

Phila. I acknowledg that there are some famous Doctors who are of this opinion, That the Pope is above the Council; but it cannot also be denied, but that the number of Learned men who hold the contrary Opinion is much the greater; and you shall scarce find a Man of Learning in all *France*, but he adheres to their Party.

Philér. I am not for entring upon this particular discourse, but you will oblige me, to shew me by good Reasons, that the Authority of Councils is the supream Authority in the Church; and that Believers ought not to acknowledg any other upon Earth in things which relate to Faith and Discipline.

Phila. To be as good as my word to you then, in what I promised you, I suppose you know the Original of Councils. A Man of your reading in the Divine History, cannot be ignorant that God himself established them, when he commanded *Moses* to take to him Seventy Elders for the Government and Conduct of his Ancient people; and you know without doubt that the *Jews* had not only their Council of Twenty three, which they called the *Lesser House of Judgment*, but also their Council of Seventy, wherein presided their *Anaci*, which Council was composed of Sacrificers, Priests and Scribes of the Law, and was called the *Greater House of Judgment*. Our Councils have been formed after this Model, and the Apostles began them at *Jerusalem*. But to remove all difficulty, our Question seems to be clearly decided by our Saviour in the 18th of *St. Matthew*, when he referreth them who had any difference, to the Church, if they could not decide it by another way, *Dic Ecclesie*, you see our Saviour referreth his Disciples to the Church, without excepting *St. Peter* himself; for which reason *St. Augustin* says very pertinently, * That the Church is the last and supreme Judgment; that *St. Peter* signified the Church, when our Saviour said to him, That whatsoever he should bind on Earth, should be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever he should loose on Earth, should be loosed in Heaven; that it is the Church which received the power of the Keys, and that if any one despiseth her when she correcteth, he ought to be looked upon as a Publican and a Sinner.

* Ep. 112.
Tra. 118. in
don. lib. 1.
pebapt. con.
Donat. cap.
51.

It is furthermore the Church which is called the Support and Pillar of Truth. * *Columna & firmamentum veritatis*. If * 1 Tim. 3. 15. you take good heed to this expression of St. Paul, and to the Reasons whereon he grounds it, you will agree that the Church is the depository of Truth, and that she hath the supreme jurisdiction over her Children for their behaviour; for it is certain in this Text, that St. Paul alludes either to the Pillars which were erected in the Heathen Temples, upon which were fixed the Statues and the Deities which were there worshipped; or to the Two Pillars of Solomon's Temple, one of which was called *Jakin*, and the other *Bohas*; and that he would have us understand by it, that it is the Churches Office to declare, to establish, and to maintain the Truth.

Philér. I see very well that the Church being the Spouse of Jesus Christ, she is made partaker of the advantages and privileges which Marriage endoweth her with; and that she being his Body, is as it were clothed with his Majesty: But St. Peter, Was not he made the Head of this Church? Did not Jesus Christ make him his Lieutenant and Vicar, when he said to him, that upon him he would build his Church? † *Tu es Petrus & super hanc Petram, &c.* Was it not to St. Peter that he gave the Sovereign Authority, when he said to him, *Dabo tibi claves Regni Cælorum & quodcunque ligaveris super Petram, &c.* † Matt. 16. 18, 19.

Phila. It is true, that all Catholick Divines do acknowledge St. Peter as the Ministerial head of the Church, and Prince of the Society of the Apostles; but this was not a principality of Dominion, which our Saviour expressly forbiddeth his Apostles: || *Reges gentium Dominantur eorum vos autem non sic.* For which reason St. Bernard says, in the 3d Book of his Considerations to Eugenius, *Imperium interdicatur, Ministerium indicitur.* || Matt. 16. 18, 19. But this is only a Primacy of Order, ∴ *Propter bonum unitatis,* Item. Luke 22. 25. says St. Cyprian; who assures us furthermore, that all the Apostles, *Erant pari consortio Honoris & Autoritatis præditi.* Matt. 20. 25. ∴ Lib. de unit. Eccl. Besides, Was not St. Peter a Member of the Church? St. Augustine and St. Cyprian says he was, and that with a great deal of reason; since that all Believers compose but one body, to whom Jesus Christ, as the Head, doth communicate the spirit of Life. It is then manifest, that the Member dependeth
C upon

upon the Body, and not the Body upon the Member. Also St. *Ambrose* says upon this Subject, in his Commentary upon St. *Luke*, That the Church is above St. *Peter*, *Ecclesia est super Petrum*. This evidently appears by what St. *Luke* says in the 15th of the *Acts*, concerning the first Council that was held among Christians, in which Assembly of the Apostles and Ministers of the Church at *Jerusalem*, the question which St. *Paul* and St. *Barnabas* related to them on the behalf of the Church of *Antioch* was decided; but they decide it not by the Authority of St. *Peter*, but by that of the Holy Ghost, and of themselves, *Visum est spiritui sancto & nobis, &c.* Also in the 21st of the same Book, St. *James* and St. *Paul* say, that they had made this Ordinance. St. *Jude* and St. *Silas* are sent, not on the behalf of St. *Peter*, but of the whole College of the Apostles. Add to this, That St. *Peter* himself was sent with St. *John*, by the Apostles, to those of *Samaria*, after they had received the Word of God, as it is related in the 8th Chapter of the same Book, which proves invincibly, that St. *Peter* was not the Sovereign Master of the Society of the Apostles, but that he was in some degree their inferior, whatsoever the place were that he held amongst them (not unlike the first Senator in the Body of a Senate) it being the right of a Superior to send an Envoy.

Phil. I apprehend very well what you say; But can it be denied, but that Jesus Christ promised somewhat particularly to St. *Peter*, in the 16th of St. *Matthew*, when he said to him in particular, *Ego vero dico tibi, &c.*?

Phila. I could tell you as a great many Catholick Divines do, That St. *Peter* having answered in the name of all the Apostles, Jesus Christ gave him nothing in particular; but what he received, he received in the name of all the Apostles, and of the whole Church of which he was then the Type, as St. *Austin* says, in the 1st Book of his *Retractions*, Cap. 21. speaking of St. *Peter*, *Typum gerebat Ecclesie cui sunt tradite* (a) De Verb. *claves*, which is founded upon the Text of the 20th of St. *John*, Dom. Serm. 13. Tract. in where Jesus Christ gives equally to all his Apostles, the power of forgiving and of retaining Sins. I could say with St. *Crisostome* upon this passage, and with (a) St. *Augustine*, That *Psal.* 86. 97, this Rock whereon Christ promiseth to build his Church, was that &c.

that firm and solid Confession of Faith which St. Peter had just then made ; or else Jesus Christ himself, who was this Corner-stone whereon was placed the mystical building of the Church. *Et super hanc Petram quam cognovisti*, says St. Augustin, *dicens tu es Christus Filius Dei viventis, edificabo Ecclesiam meam*, id est, *super me, ipsum Filium Dei edificabo Ecclesiam meam, super me edificabo te, non me super te.* (a) St. Cyril, (b) St. Hilary, (c) St. Ambrose, and (d) St. Hierom are of this opinion ; but to deal freely with you, it is none of mine : For I had rather take this Text, as (e) Tertullian and St. Cyprian, and say with these other Doctors, That Jesus Christ spoke in particular to St. Peter, and promised him some Prerogatives above his Colleagues. And to justify my Opinion, I observe first, That St. Peter answers in particular concerning his Faith. Now Faith is so internal a thing, that nothing but the Conscience of each particular person can answer for it ; and by consequence we cannot say that this Apostle answered in the name of the whole Society of the Apostles. When it concerned some outward thing which was obvious to the senses, this Apostle might answer in the name of all his Brethren, as when he says to our Saviour, We have left all to follow thee. *Omnia, &c.* But when the question was concerning a motion of the heart, he could not answer for any but himself.

Secondly, You must observe that our Saviour promisseth a particular recompence to the Faith of Peter ; for which, after that the Apostle had said, *Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi*, He Answers him, *Ego vero dico tibi quia tu es Petrus beatus es Simon Barjona*, to make him know, that he would reward particularly the strength of his Faith, and the fervency of his Zeal. For this reason he puts him in mind of the new name he had given him, *Tu es Petrus*, says he, and furthermore, *& super hanc Petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam.* He makes him understand by this, That he shall not bear the name of Peter in vain, since he intended to build his Church upon this Foundation-stone ; and tho the Evangelist St. Matthew changeth the Term, yet it cannot be inferred from thence that he changeth the Subject ; because that *Cephas*, the Syriack term, which our Saviour used, when he said to Simon the Son of Jona, *Thou art Peter*, signifies a Rock ; so that to translate the Syriack letter

(a) Cyril. lib. 4. de Trinit.
(b) Hil. lib. 2. & 6. de Trin.
(c) Amb. in c. 2. de Episto.
(d) Hiero. lib. cont Jov. c. 19.
(e) Tert. lib. 1. de pud. cap. 21.
(f) Cypr. Ep.

(g) V. 14.

which Jesus Christ made use of, we must say, that our Saviour said to *Simon* the Son of *Jona*, Thou art a Rock, and upon this Rock will I build my Church. And it cannot be denied, but that *St. Peter* was a fundamental stone whereon Jesus Christ did build his Church, since that in the 21st of the *Revelations*, the Apostles are called, (g) *Fundamenta cælestis Jerusalem*. You will be fully confirmed in this opinion, if you observe that the Church is oftentimes compared in Scripture to a Temple, to a House, Believers are the living Stones of it. Jesus Christ is the Corner-Stone, and the Apostles the Foundation-stones: And of these *St. Peter* is to be accounted the first, because he laid the first foundation of this mystical building. To these two Observations I would add a third, drawn from the *Hebrew* Language, amongst whom those who beget Children are called the Foundations of Houses. Who then can doubt in either sense, but that *St. Peter* is one of these Foundation-stones; nay, the very Foundation-stone it self, since that by his Preaching, full of Faith and of Zeal, he laid the first Foundation of the Christian Church, and begat Children unto God, as well of the Jewish People as of the Gentiles?

I say the same thing of what our Saviour added, That he would give him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: These Keys are Keys of an Authority; not of Dominion and of Empire, but of Jurisdiction and of Direction, such as belong to a Steward, and such as God promised to lay upon the Shoulders of *Eliakim* in the 22d of *Isaiah*: We may also say, that Jesus Christ alluded to the Custom of the *Jews*, who invested their Doctors by the ceremony of delivering to them the Keys; or to the Custom of the *Pharisees*, who attributed to themselves the power of binding; who called every thing bound which was prohibited; and that loosed which was allowed of. No Man therefore can deny but that *St. Peter* was established the principal Doctor of the Christian Church, and that the Keys of Heavenly Knowledge, whereof he just then gave an admirable proof, were committed to him. He loosed both the *Jews* and the *Gentiles*: Those from the Observation of the Ceremonies of the Law, and the Traditions of their forefathers, which was a grievous burthen; these from the
false

false Opinions and false Worships wherein they had been bred : And he confirmed both the one and the other in the belief of the Mysteries of Salvation, and in the practice of the Maxims of the Gospel. In all these respects, who can doubt but that St. Peter received in a particular manner the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven ?

Philér. All that you have said seems to me to be very good, and very solid ; but what had St. Peter to his own particular in all this ? Are not the other Apostles, as well as St. Peter, these Foundation-stones of the Church, in the sense which you have observed ? Were not the other Apostles, as well as St. Peter, established the Infallible Doctors of the Church ? Did not they all make use of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven in binding and loosing upon Earth the sins of Men ?

Phila. I agree with you in all you say : But though these Privileges were common to all the Apostles, that doth not at all hinder St. Peter's having them after an Eminent manner ; and in this respect he had certainly some Prerogatives above his Brethren. They were all of them Foundation-Stones whereon Jesus Christ built his Church : But it may be said, that St. Peter laid the Foundation of this mystical building after a most singular manner, not only because he set the first hand to it, but also because he built this House all the World over, by the means of those, who having been taught immediately from his mouth, and dispersed at length throughout the World, Preached the Gospel every where. They all received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, but St. Peter was the first that with his Keys opened the Doors of this Kingdom, and made a larger use of it than the others. You see also that he was the first called to the Apostleship ; That he shewed also a particular zeal and love for his Master, who distinguished him from the others by his favours, and by the name of Peter which he gave him ; But all these Prerogatives give him only a Primacy of Order, and not of Dominion ; an Authority, not of Empire and of Monarchy, but of Precedency and of Direction, such as that of a first President in a Senate, or of a famous Philosopher among those of his Profession ; for which reason, (a) St. Jerom says of St. Peter, that he was the

(a) Dial. l.
first cap. 4.

first of the Apostles, as *Plato* was the Prince of the Philosophers.

Philér. I am convinced of the truth of what you say; But doth it not appear in the 21st of *St. John*, that *Jesus Christ* gives, even an Authority of Dominion to *St. Peter* above his Brethren, whom he distinguisheth by the name of Sheep, as other common believers by the name of Lambs?

Phila. You can conclude nothing from that Text in favour of the Monarchical authority of *St. Peter*; for in this place, according to the opinion of (a) *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, and (b) *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Jesus Christ* did only renew to *St. Peter* the dignity of his Apostleship, which he enjoyed but as the other Apostles did, that he might not think he had lost it by his three times denying his Master; and for this reason it is, that he bids him three times to feed his Sheep. It is to no purpose to seek after a Mystery in the terms of *ἡγεμονία* and *ἐκκλησία*, and of *ἐπίσκοπος* and *ἀρχιεπίσκοπος*, since that the two first signify at the bottom the same thing, and the two last are given indifferently to Believers in the Scripture. The holy Fathers do also hold, that the Apostles received the same right, and the same power as *St. Peter*, when our Saviour said to him, *Pasce oves meas*, according to (c) *St. Basil*, (d) *St. Greg. Nazianzen*, (e) *St. Ambrose*, and (f) *St. Augustin*. We might add to this what (g) *Tertullian* says, That all the Apostles had an equal power, and that they were all the same as *St. Peter* was, as (b) *St. Cyprian* explains it; and that they had (e) *Ambrose* all the same dignity, as Pope (i) *Gelasius* says.

(c) *Basil. de Pasce oves meas*, according to (c) *St. Basil*, (d) *St. Greg. Nazianzen*, (e) *St. Ambrose*, and (f) *St. Augustin*. We might add to this what (g) *Tertullian* says, That all the Apostles had an equal power, and that they were all the same as *St. Peter* was, as (b) *St. Cyprian* explains it; and that they had (e) *Ambrose* all the same dignity, as Pope (i) *Gelasius* says.

(f) *Aug. de Agon. Chr. cap. 30. lib. quest. vet. No. Test. quest. 57. & Tract. 47. in Job.*
 (g) *Tertull. Carm. (b) Cypr. lib. de unitat. Ecclesiæ. (i) Append. com. Theod. Ep. 8.*

Philér. I am very well satisfied as to your first proof, and I think you have shewed sufficiently by the Holy Scripture, that the supreme Authority is in the Church, and in the Council which represents it; That *St. Peter* himself, tho he were the Prince of the Apostles, was subject to it; and that he was not looked upon as the supreme Judge in things that concerned Religion, but as the first Minister in the College of the Apostles. I desire you now to pass on to your second proof, and to shew me by the perpetual and constant Tradition of the Church,

Church, that the Popes who have succeeded *St. Peter*, were never considered as the supreme arbitrators of things concerning Religion, but that the Sovereign Authority to which the Popes themselves ought to be subject, was esteemed ever to be in the Council.

Phila. I will readily perform the promise I made to you; but I would have you observe by the by, That the Bishops of *Rome* have not succeeded *St. Peter* in the charge of his Apostleship, which was a personal employment, and particular to those whom Jesus Christ had immediately called, whom he had Baptized by his Holy Spirit, and enriched with extraordinary gifts, by which means these blessed people were Infallible, and possessed a sovereign and Independent Authority in the Church, and a Ministry which was not restrained to a certain place, but which was dispersed throughout the whole World. I would also have you observe, That the succession of the Bishops of *Rome* to *St. Peter*, was but in the charge of a Bishop, whereof *St. Peter*, and the rest of the Apostles did communicate the Rights or Prerogatives to their successors; and that this Charge hath this common Right with the Apostleship, that it confers the power of Preaching the Word, of administering the Sacraments, and of using the power of the Keys; but it gives no infallibility or power of exercising the Ecclesiastical Ministry all the World over. After this Observation, which is not amiss to our purpose, I come to what I promised you.

And I observe in the first place, that in the most Ancient Monuments of Christian Antiquity, I find no traces of this Supreme Power which the *Roman* Bishops of the last Ages would attribute to themselves. We have the Epistles of *St. Ignatius*, which are of an Apostolick Character; but there is not so much as the least foot-step of this supreme Authority attributed to the See of *Rome*; This Holy Prelate speaks of the Church of *Rome* as of other Churches; He calleth it the Church sanctified and illuminated by the will of God, without giving it the least authority over any other; and in his 7th Epistle to those of *Smyrna*, he directeth it to the Bishop in the name of the Church, and acknowledgeth nothing above him, which he would never have done, had he believed the Bishop of *Rome* to have been not only above other Bishops,

†

but

but also above a Council. St. *Justin Martyr*, in his Apology for the Christians, gives an account to the Emperor *Antoninus*, of the behaviour of Believers in his time, but there is not one word of a superior and supreme Master that resided at *Rome*, and made his Sovereign decision concerning matters of Religion. St. *Polycarp*, the Disciple of St. *John*, as *Eusebius* relates it, in his Book of Ecclesiastical History, came to *Rome* to confer with *Anicetus*, who was there Bishop, concerning the day whereon he was to keep *Easter*; but yet he followed not this Bishops Opinion, which without doubt he would have done, if it had been true, that the Bishop of *Rome* had been at that time held the supreme Judge of the Church. St. *Irenæus*, Bishop of *Lyons*, in his Epistle to *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, as † *Eusebius* saith, sharply reproves him for separating from his Communion the *Eastern* Church, because they would not keep *Easter* upon the same day that he did. How could this Bishop have reproved things of this nature, if he had believed that *Victor* had been in this conjuncture the absolute judge, to whose Decisions, and to whose Tribunal the Church was obliged to submit? There were several Synods held both in the *East* and *West*; There was one in the *East*, where *Policrates* Bishop of *Ephesus* presided, wherein far from acknowledging the Bishop of *Rome* for the Arbitrator of the whole Church, they condemn his opinion, as *Eusebius* witnesseth. Was not there a Council also held in *France*, our own Country, wherein the Bishop of *Rome* had no share? But St. *Irenæus* presided and wrote a very pressing letter to *Victor*, to oblige him to retain Communion with the *Eastern* Churches? Do you think now seriously, that things would have been carried thus, if they had believed that the Bishop of *Rome* had held a Sovereign authority in the Church?

Some time afterwards, the Heretick *Novatians*, whose Picture *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* hath drawn in his Epistle to *Fabian* Bishop of *Antioch*, being deprived of the *Roman* Chair, which he had usurped, and where he had published this Error, That they ought not to be admitted to Repentance who had fallen into grievous sins; *Cornelius* did not undertake of himself to condemn this Error, which he would have done without all question, if he had thought himself to have been

the sovereign Arbitrator of the Church, but he assembled at *Rome* a Council of Sixty Bishops. There were also held without any order of *Cornelius*, many Councils in divers places, namely at *Antioch*, which had been an horrible attempt had *Cornelius* been the absolute Magistrate of the Christian Commonwealth. *Matthew*, Bishop of *Arles*, having joyned himself to *Novatian*, *Faustinus* Bishop of *Lyons* did not address himself to *Cornelius*, but to St. *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, who wrote to the neighbouring Bishops of *France*, and to the Bishop of *Rome*, to exhort them to do their Duty; and in this Letter he saith, That he held in his own hand the ballance of the Church Government: Doth not all this then demonstratively prove, that the Bishop of *Rome* was not at that time looked upon as the Monarch of the Church? I add to these Examples that of the famous Council of *Antioch*, held in the year 265. against *Paulus Samosatenus*, wherein assisted more than 270. Bishops. This sworn enemy of our Saviour's Divinity being relapsed into the Heresy which he had formerly abjured in an Assembly held in the same City, and because he could not be brought back to his Duty, by the Letters and Remonstrances of the neighbouring Bishops, it was their Opinion to call a Council; and to this purpose *Helenus* Bishop of *Tharsus*, and *Theoctistus* Bishop of *Cesarea* in *Palestine*, invited *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, chief of the Diocess of *Egypt*, and *Firmilian* of *Cesaria* in *Cappadocia*, chief of the Diocess of *Pontus*, to the Convocation of a Council, which was at length holden at *Antioch*, without the order of *Felix* Bishop of *Rome*; and they did proceed against *Paulus Samosatenus*, tho it doth not appear that any body, I won't say, presided, but so much as assisted on the behalf of that Bishop; and at length they ended the Assembly by a Synodal Letter which they sent to *Dionysius*, whom they thought yet in possession of the *Roman* Chair (tho he were dead in the Month of *September* the year before) to *Maternus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, and to all their fellow Bishops, Priests and Deacons, throughout the whole Earth, and to the whole Catholick Church under Heaven. This had been a very irregular proceeding, if the Bishop of *Rome* had been the supreme Magistrate of the Church. We may add to this, what the Council of *Alexandria* did in regard

of *Origen* under *Demetrius*, for they condemned this Doctor whilst he was yet living; and also under *Theodosius*, in whose Reign they Anathematized his Doctrine and his Memory, and all this without the Order, Intention, or Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, which they had not dared to have undertaken, had they believed that this Bishop had had the supreme Authority in the Church. From all this Truth, which I have told you thus at large, may be gathered, That in these Primitive Ages of Christianity, the See of *Rome* was really considered as the first in place, as the Chair of *St. Peter*, and the Center of Prietly Unity, as *St. Cyprian* calls it, in his Epistle to *Cornelius*; but that it was not looked upon as the supreme Tribunal of things that concerned Religion.

Philér. I gather from this Discourse, that you have now made, that in these Primitive Ages, wherein the Holy Bishops of *Rome* aspired to no other Crown than that of Martyrdom, and shared nothing amongst them but the Cross; before the Spirit of Ambition and of Dominion had entred into the heads of any of these Prelates, That the Spirit of Charity and of Humility, which is the spirit of the Gospel, did perfectly animate them, and that all the Bishops living in this good understanding, and in this union which Jesus Christ recommends so strictly to his Disciples; they did communicate from one to the other the exigencies and necessities of their Churches; that to heal the evils which molested them, they chose out themselves the remedies which they judged most convenient; and the most effectual means, and that which they oftenest made use of, was the Convocation of Synods, to whom the Grace of the Holy Spirit, as *St. Cyprian* says, was never wanting for the good and edification of their Flocks. And this which you have now related, brings into my memory many such like methods of our Ancient Bishops of *France*, which I think I have read in *St. Gregory of Tours*; But can you shew me in the following Ages this same method of acting, and this Tradition of the Church which you have called perpetual and constant?

Phila. I hope I shall make good my Promise; I own that the Heathen Emperors having embraced Christianity, the Church having been enriched by their liberality, and her Ministers

nisters raised to a degree of Honour more considerable in the World by the effects of these Princes Piety, things began to put on another face, and the Bishops to take place according to the dignity of the Cities wherein they exercised their Ministry, and to change that deference and honour that was given them before, into a sort of jurisdiction, as many people have own'd, and among others * Cardinal *Baronius*, and as * In Anno 39. may be gathered out of the 17th Canon of the Council of *Calcedon*; But whatever alteration the Conversion of Emperors and of Kings, might have caused in the condition of the Prelates, and in the Government of the Church, it cannot be denied but that the Church Government remained still the same in substance, and in what was essential to it, and that they were always vigorously opposed, who endeavoured to innovate and to introduce in the Church a Monarchical Government; so that the Sovereign Authority remained always in the Councils, who in these latter Ages have openly declared themselves against those who would have robbed them of this privilege.

The first example that I remember, which justifieth the Sovereign Authority of the Church, and which proves that the Bishops of *Rome* were dependants on it, is that of the Council of *Arles*, assembled, if I am not mistaken, by the Emperor *Constantine*, in the year 314, and composed of 200 Bishops, called together from divers Provinces of the Empire. You know that the Causes of this Councils being called, were the differences that happened between *Donatus* of *Casanigra*, and *Cecilian* Bishop of *Carthage*, who had been deposed by an Assembly of Bishops (wherein *Secundus* the Bishop of *Tigisis*, and Primate of *Numidia* presided) these differences having divided *Africa*, some Synodal Assemblies having established *Cecilian*, and others *Donatus*. I will not pretend to give an account of this History, which you may have read in divers Authors, † and particularly in *St. Austin* in his Epistles 68. † Euseb. lib. 15. Opat. Mil. cont. advers. Parin. lib. 1. and 162, where you may see how *Constantine* commanded the Proconsul *Ælius* to hear all Parties, and to give judgment, and that the *Donatists* were there condemned by the Sentence of the Proconsul. The Schismatics then applied themselves to the Emperor, who, to put an end to their differences,

named first of all *Matronus* Bishop of *Cologne*, *Delicins* Bishop of *Autun*, and *Marinus* Bishop of *Arles*, and to these three he at length joyned *Melciades* Bishop of *Rome*, and Fifteen other *Italian* Bishops, of which number was the Bishop of *Milan*; these Nineteen Bishops gave their judgments in favour of *Cecilian*; the *Donatists* being condemned, Appealed from this judgment, and accused their Judges of being too precipitate. What now did the Emperor *Constantine*? He did not tell these Sectaries, that the judgment that had condemned them had been given by the Sovereign Judge of the Church; but he called a General Council in the City of *Arles*, to examin the matter over again, which had been judged by the Bishop of *Rome*, and the other Eighteen Bishops, which was done in the presence of two Priests, and two Deacons whom *Sylvester*, that succeeded *Melciades*, had sent thither, who sat also no higher than in the 5th place. The condemnation of the *Donatists* was confirmed in this Assembly; they also decided the question concerning the Baptism of Hereticks, and gave it otherwise than the Bishop of *Rome* had adjudged it, or *St. Cyprian* explained it; which decision held the just medium between these two Opinions. From hence it appeareth clearly enough, That the Bishop of *Rome* did not believe himself above the Council, since that he suffered what he had already adjudged to be examined in the Council: It appeareth also, that both the Bishops of those days, and the Emperor *Constantine*, believed the Authority of Councils to be Sovereign, and that in matters of Faith a Council may decide otherwise than the Pope, since that the Council of *Arles* did pronounce concerning Baptism of Hereticks otherwise than the Pope did. You may see also notable proofs of this same spirit which animated the Bishops of those times in the famous Council of *Nice*, composed of 318 Bishops, Assembled in the 325. year of our Lord, under the same *Constantine*. The reason why this Council was called, was, as you know, the Heresy of *Arrius*, which set all the *East* in confusion, and the difference among the Churches concerning the day whereon they should keep *Easter*. You know without doubt, that this Heresiarch having appeared in the year 315, *Alexander* his Bishop endeavoured to reduce him from his Error. He called together two Councils of all the Bishops.

Bishops of *Egypt*, of *Lybia* and of *Pentapolis*, who depended upon his See, and in these Councils *Arrius* was Deposed and Excommunicated without the mediate or immediate intervention of the Bishop of *Rome*, to whom *Alexander* thought it sufficient to give advice of all that passed in the Councils; but the Emperor seeing to his great regret that all the care of *Alexander* could not hinder the great progress of this Heresie, he made the famous *Hosius* to come from *Corduba*, and sent him to *Alexander* to endeavour to end the difference. All the endeavours of this famous Prelate proving fruitless, he joyned his Prayers to those of *Alexander*, and they both of them humbly intreated his Imperial Majesty to apply a speedy and an effectual remedy to this evil, by the Convocation of an Oecumenical Council. This Great Prince, who had nothing more at heart than the Glory of God, and the good of his Church, gave a favourable answer to the intentions of *Alexander* and of *Hosius*. He Assembled a Council at *Nice*, a City of *Bitbynia*, which was opened the 22. of *May*, in the year 325, and ended the 25th. of *August* in the same year. Never was there in any Assembly so much Learning and Piety; whatever there was either Learned or Holy in the whole Earth you had in that blessed Assembly, which hath been and ever will be a Rampart to the true Christian Faith. St. *Sylvester* Bishop of *Rome* not being able to be there himself, assisted by his Envoys, who were *Vitus* and *Vincentius*, Presbyters of his Church. The Admirable *Hosius* there presided, and they there solemnly condemned *Arrius* and his Doctrine. They there regulated the difference about *Easter*, and Ordained that it should be Celebrated the Sunday after the Full Moon of *March*. They made in all Twenty five Canons, whereof the Fifth doth prohibit Bishops to receive to their Communion those who should have been Excommunicated by others; and because those who were Excommunicated might complain that they had been unjustly proceeded against, it was Ordained, that the justice of their Excommunication should be examined in the Council of Bishops of each Province. And the Sixth Canon gave bounds and limits to the Diocesses of Metropolitans, according to the Ancient Customs, that those who were subject to their inspection might so remain, but also that

that no greater extent should be given them; and that accordingly the Bishop of *Alexandria* should have power in *Egypt*, in *Lybia*, and in *Pentapolis*, and the Bishop of *Rome* in the Diocese which was under him: *Quia* (says the Council) *Episc. Rom. pariter Mor est.*

A man must wilfully shut his eyes not, to see in all this proceeding, that in those days it was a vain thing to doubt of the Supreme Authorities being in the Council, and that all Bishops, he of *Rome* not excepted, were subject to it. For first of all, you see that when *Arrius* would have taught against the purity of the Faith, *Alexander* having used the way of giving him particular admonishment, had no recourse to the Bishop of *Rome* for the condemnation of this Heretick, but himself assembled the Council of the great Diocese whereof he was Head; which certainly he would not have done, had he thought that the Supreme Authority belonged absolutely to the Bishop of *Rome*. Secondly, *Hosius* and *Alexander* having conferred together, and found that the only remedy for this Heresie was the Convocation of a General Synod, addressed themselves to the Emperor *Constantine*, to desire him to call it: If they had believed that the Sovereign Tribunal of the Church had been the See of *Rome*, why did not they cite *Arrius* thither? Why did they take the way of a Council, which is the longest and the most difficult? or at least why did they not apply themselves to the Bishop of *Rome* to call it, as hath been done since the Popes have raised themselves above these Ancient Rules? Thirdly, If the Bishops of the Council had believed that the Bishops of *Rome* had had the Supreme Authority, why did they place *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* in the Chair of President, rather than *Vitus* and *Vincentius* the Popes Envoys and Deputies, as hath been practised in the late Councils of the *Latin* Church? Fourthly, If these Fathers had believed that the last Decision of Ecclesiastical Affairs belonged to the Pope, how would they have dared to start the question upon what day they should keep *Easter*, since that the Bishop of *Rome* had explained himself long since upon this matter. Fifthly, If the Fathers of this Council had looked upon the Pope as a Superior Judge over the Council, how could they have Ordained that those who had been Excommunicated

municated by one Bishop, could not be received by another? And how could they have committed to Provincial Synods the Examination of the validity or invalidity of Excommunications? Might not they rather have permitted those who were grieved by the sentence of Excommunication, to appeal to the See of *Rome* to quash or to confirm it as they should think fit? Lastly, Since they regulate the power of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, after the example of the Bishop of *Rome*, within the limits of the Ancient Usage, doth not this shew that the Bishop of *Rome* should not extend his power over other Churches than those which had been under him by the Ancient Customs; and that he should govern these Churches after the same manner as the Bishop of *Alexandria* did govern those of *Egypt*, of *Lybia*, and of *Pentapolis*, which depended upon him, and that so his Authority was restrained within certain bounds, and subject, as well as that of the Bishop of *Alexandria* and other Metropolitans, to the Authority of the Council?

Philér. You have, methinks, sufficiently shewed by all that passed in this Holy and famous Council of *Nice*, whose conduct and form ought for ever to be a Pattern and Model to the Church, that there is no other Sovereign Authority in the Church, than that of Oecumenical Councils; but to confirm me the more in this opinion, do me the favour to shew me, that in all other Councils of this nature, they acted after the same manner.

Phila. As I have already promised you, it is just that I keep my word to you; but it shall be, if you please, in very few words, and touching only upon what concerns our subject; for should I make a relation of all, it would be impossible for us to end it in this Discourse. The second Oecumenical Council held against the Heretick *Macedonius*, who disputed the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, was called by the Emperor *Theodosius*, in the City of *Constantinople*, though the Pope *Damasus* desired that it might be held at *Rome*, as you may see in the Synodal Epistle of this Council written to *Damasus*, to *Ambrase*, and to many others assembled at *Rome*, and related by

(e) *Theodoret*, (f) *Socrat*. (g) *Sozomen*, (h) and *Nicephorus*.

This Council wherein the Pope *Damasus* neither assisted in person, nor by his Deputies, Established *Nectarius* Patriarch

Anno 383.

(e) *Theod.* lib.

5. cap. 9.

(f) *Soc.* lib. 5.

cap. 8.

(g) *Soz.* lib. 7.

cap. 7.

(h) *Nicephor.*

lib. 12. cap. 1.

of

of *Constantinople*, and *Flavian* Patriarch of *Antioch*. It made two Canons which are for our subject, namely the Sixth and the Third; the Third importeth, that after the Bishop of *Rome*, the Bishop of *Constantinople* ought to have the same Privileges of Honours, &c. And the Sixth says, that the Bishop shall be judged by the other Bishops of his Province; and that in case of Appeal the matter shall be ended by the other Bishops of the Diocese; and lastly by a General Council. You see then, my dear *Philérène*, that it was the Council which created Patriarchs; which is an act of Supreme Authority, and which clearly sheweth that the Authority of Patriarchs is subalterne and dependant. You see that the Councils regulate the place of Patriarchs, giving the second to him of *Constantinople*, because that this City was the new *Rome*, and placing after him the Patriarch of *Alexandria*. This sheweth that they followed the same order in Ecclesiastical Sees, as in Bodies Politick; and that their addition of Honour and Glory was attributed to the Rank and to the Magnificence of the Cities where they were Established. You see that the Council doth not at last send Appeals from the Judgments of the Bishops to the See of *Rome* to be there finally determined, but to an Oecumenical Council; which sheweth evidently that this Council did not believe any thing above an Oecumenical Council, and that every thing ought to be subject to it.

Philér. But do not you know, my dear *Philalethe*, that *Baronius*, and after him *Binius*, have shewed by many reasons, that the third Canon of this Council is counterfeit; and that they have affirmed that the Sixth is not to be found in the *Roman Code*, nor in the Abridgements of *Caranza*, and of *Sagittarius*?

Phila. I know very well what the Cardinal *Baronius* hath said to make the Third Canon of this Council be suspected; and I know the attempts of the *Latin* Collectors; but you must consult the Originals in *Greek*, which is sufficient to defeat entirely the reasons of *Baronius*. We see in the *Greek* Originals the Seven Canons that this Council made, among which are the Third and Sixth in the order and in the terms which we have them. Add to this the Evidence of 630 Bishops, who assisted in the Council of *Chalcedon*, and who in the

the 20th Canon of this Council, make mention of the 3d Canon made by the Fathers of *Constantinople*.

Philér. This gives me some sort of satisfaction; but I have one scruple more upon this Subject, which is, that it is not likely that the Council of *Constantinople*, that was composed of 150 Fathers, would pronounce, upon this matter, quite otherwise than the Council of *Sardica* had done, which was composed of Three hundred Bishops, and held in the year 347, who in their 3d and 7th Canons reserve last Appeals to the See of *Rome*.

Phila. I agree with you in what you say concerning the Council of *Sardica*; But first of all, this Council was not received as Oecumenical, tho it were called for that intention. It was added to the *Roman Code* in the year 527. and it was afterward received in the year 591. to the second Canon of the 6th Council, but as a particular Council, and it was placed after the Councils of *Constantinople* and of *Ephesus*. St. *Gregory* * himself doth not reckon it among the Oecumenical Councils. Besides, you must observe what was the cause of the making of these Canons, and in what terms they were expressed. The Cause was the evil dealing which the famous St. *Athanasius* met with at the hand of the *Eastern Bishops*, who were all *Arrians*, or *Demi-Arians*. By the 12th Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, which was held in the year 341. it was carried, That a Bishop being deposed by the Synod of his Province, ought to address himself to a greater Synod, and undergo their judgment, and by this greater was understood the Patriarchal Synod, from which there was no Appeal, as may be seen, *Nov. Just. 123. cap. 22.* In the 15th Canon of the same Council it is said, That when all the Bishops of a Province were of one Opinion, there was no Appeal. Now St. *Athanasius* had been condemned by the Synod of his Diocese, where he suspected almost all his Judges, since they were his Enemies; as had plainly appeared in their Cabal at the Councils of *Tyre* and of *Antioch*, where the *Eusebians* were the Masters. What could this Holy Bishop do less than have recourse to *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*, who was Orthodox, and to his Council composed of Fifty *Western Bishops*, to save himself from their oppression? Was not *Julius* and his Council

* *Greg. lib. Ep. 24.*

cil now obliged to maintain, in this conjuncture, the Interest of this Man's Injured Innocence, and likewise of the Son of God, who was himself persecuted in the person of his Servant? This they did with a great deal of Zeal and Prudence. They declared this Holy persecuted Man Innocent, and admitted him to the Communion of the Bishop of *Rome*, who wrote to his passionate Judges, exhorting them to appear, not before himself, but before a Synod composed of lawful Judges, according to the decisions of the Council of *Nice*, which ordereth, that what hath been treated of in one Council, shall be examined before another. These unjust Judges made a very ill return to the Kindness and Charity of *Julius*; they sent him back a most injurious Answer; and besides, being broken up from *Sardica*, where they had been Assembled by order of the Emperors, *Constance* and *Constantius*, to hold a General Council according to the advice that *Hosius* had given to *Constance*, and retiring to *Philipopolis*, they there held a Factious Cabal; wherein these unworthy Prelates Excommunicate *Julius*, *Hosius*, and all those who had received St. *Athanasius* to their Communion. What now did the true and lawful Council of *Sardica* in this Case? On one hand they excommunicated these wretched men who had been so rash as to excommunicate him, and confirmed the Sentence given by *Julius*, and by his Council, in favour of St. *Athanasius*; and on the other, that the Catholick Bishops who should be agrieved by the Sentence of the *Eastern* Bishops, who were the most part of them *Arrians* or *Semi-Arrians*, might find a means to free themselves from their oppression, they declared by the 3d and 4th Canons, That if any person should find himself agrieved by the Sentence of any Synod of his Province, he might have recourse from their judgment; in which Case the Bishops of the Province who had judged, should write to *Julius* the Reasons of their Judgment; That if these Reasons were approved of by *Julius*, the Judgment should hold; but if on the contrary, the Reasons were not found pertinent, the Bishop of *Rome* should write to the Bishops of the neighbouring Province to examin the matter over a-new, and to judge of it according to the Canons: Wherein you see, that the design of the Council was only to justify the conduct of

St.

St. *Athanasius*, who had had recourse to *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*; and likewise the behaviour of *Julius* and of his Council, and to provide an effectual remedy for the misfortune of Schism, to preserve Innocence from being oppressed in an evil conjuncture. But you cannot conclude, from the behaviour of this Council, that the Pope was looked upon as their Superior; on the contrary, it appears plainly, that it was the Council that did acts of Superiority; be it for that they examined a-new the affair of St. *Athanasius*, which the Pope and his Council had judged, or for that the Council wrote to the Pope to publish his Decrees in *Sicily*, *Sardinia* and *Italy*; or because they accepted the excuse which the Pope made them for his absence; all which things are acts of Superiority: To which we must not forget to add, that the Fathers of this Council calling the Pope in the Letter which they wrote to him, their Brother and their fellow Minister, makes it very apparent, that they did not acknowledg him for their Superior. Besides, let me advertise you, as we proceed, that this Council was not composed of 300 Bishops, as you have said, they were but about 100. and they all *Western* except *Macarius* and *Asterius*, who were of the *East*. It is true, that the Emperors *Constance* and *Constantius* had called together this Council of Bishops out of these two Empires, and that there came to *Sardis* to the number of 150. as St. *Athanasius* witnesseth; but all the *Eastern* Bishops, who were for the most part *Arrians*, retired to *Philippopolis*. And altho St. *Athanasius* saith in some places, that the Council was composed of 300 Bishops, it is because it was subscribed by a great number of Prelates that did not assist at it.

Philér. Can you shew me that the same Spirit reigned in the two other great Councils, namely in the Council of *Ephesus*, and in that of *Chalcedon*?

Phila. The thing is not difficult; you know the History of these two Councils, and are not ignorant that the first was called by the Emperor *Theodosius* in the year 431. as may be seen in * *Socrates*, and in † *Evagrius*, and that it was Assem- * *Socrat. lib. i.*
bled against the Heresy of *Nestorius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, cap. 33.
who divided Jesus Christ into two persons. *Celestin* Bishop of † *Evag. lib. i.*
Rome, being advertised of this Heresy, by *Cyrill* Bishop of cap. 3.

Alexandria, called together at *Rome* his Synod, which condemned it, and excommunicated *Nestorius*. *Cyrril*, who, for his part, had done all that he could to convince and bring back this wandering Sheep, Assembled also his Synod, who did no less than that of *Rome* had done; but as these particular Councils were not a sufficient remedy, there was called an Oecumenical one in the City of *Ephesus*, whither *Celestin* sent his Legates, namely two Bishops and one Priest, and wherein presided *Cyrril* Bishop of *Alexandria*, after whom the first of *Celestines* Legates was seated. Here were made Eight Canons, of which the eighth makes chiefly for our purpose: For to restrain the attempts of the Patriarch of *Antioch* upon the liberties of the Churches of *Cyprus*, it ordaineth, that not only in *Cyprus*, but in all other Diocesses and Provinces of the World, no Bishop should usurp any Province, which from the beginning had not been of his dependance; and that every Province should preserve inviolably the Rights which she hath had from the beginning, and according to the Ancient Custom. Who can say but that this Council doth all the acts of a Supreme Authority? And that the Bishop of *Rome* doth none at all? If he had had any, after that he and his Council had condemned *Nestorius*, it had not been necessary to call a General Council for it; the first of his Legates would, without question, have presided in this Council, and this Holy Assembly would not have undertaken to make General Decrees, which limit the Power of all Bishops, without excepting even him of *Rome*.

You have also read, without doubt, what the same *Socrates* says of the Council of *Chalcedon*, called by the Emperor *Martianus* in the year 451. to stifle the Heresy of *Eutiches*, who confounded the two Natures in Jesus Christ; you may thence have learned, that a General Council having been called by *Theodosius* the second, in the City of *Ephesus*, *Eutiches*, by the intrigues and artifices of *Dioscorus*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, set himself in this Factious Cabal, against *Flavian*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who was there deposed, because he had deposed and condemned this Heretick; for which Reason this unhappy Assembly was called *Latrocinium*, or the Robbery, that at length the Orthodox Bishops, as namely *Leo* the great, Bi-

shop of *Rome*, as may be seen in the 23, 25, and 26 of his Letters, intreated the Emperor to call an Oecumenical Council, which because *Theodosius* either could not or would not do, *Martianus*, who succeeded him, did it, having Assembled this Council, not at *Rome*, as *Leo* would have had it, but first at *Nice*, and then at *Chalcedon*, as is to be seen in the 43, 44, 49, 50, and 51 of this Popes Epistles. This Council composed of 630 Bishops, restored the memory of *Flavian*, by condemning and deposing *Dioscore* and *Eutiches*. They made many Canons; in their 17th it is ordained, that the order of Parishes in the Church should be according to the Politick and Civil form. In the 29th. they Decree, that a Clergy-man, having a difference with his Bishop, shall be judged by the Synod of his Province; and if a Bishop hath a difference with the Metropolitan of the Province, let him address himself to the Exarch of the Diocess, or to the Bishop of the Royal City of *Constantinople*. And in the 28th they do ordain, That according to the decision of 150 Fathers of *Constantinople*, Privileges equal to those of old *Rome*, should be given to the most Holy See of New *Rome*, because she was honoured with the seat of the Empire and of the Senate; and that in things Ecclesiastical she ought not to be held in lesser dignity, tho she took but the second place. A Man must wilfully shut his eyes, not to see that this Council did not consider the Bishop of *Rome*, as having in his hands the Supreme Authority, since that they do not send the differences that might happen between Bishops and their Metropolitans to him for their last determination, and that they make the Bishop of *Constantinople* equal to him in Ecclesiastical Affairs, reserving to him simply the primacy of Order, because his See was the City of *Rome*, where the Emperors and the Senate formerly did reside: To which we ought to add, what we read in the Letter of the Fathers of this Council to *Leo* Bishop of *Rome*; where they say freely, That they had appointed and confirmed what had been already ordain'd by the Council of *Constantinople*, tho *Leo's* Legates opposed it, wherein they tell him, that he ought to acquiesce, not only for the conservation of Order, but also out of Deference to the Emperors, who had given them so absolute an Authority, that their Judgments passed for a Law, reflecting
without

without doubt, upon the Ordinance of *Valentinian* the third, made in favour of the See of *Rome*. Lastly, We ought to observe, That the Fathers who composed this Council, founded not the Privilege of Episcopal Sees, but upon the Civil and Politick Prerogatives of the Cities where they were; which sheweth, That the Eminence of that of *Rome*, was not founded upon the Primacy of *St. Peter*, who had been the first Bishop of it, so much as upon the dignity of the City. I could add to the Authority of these four great Councils, that of the second Council of *Constantinople*, which is the Fifth Oecumenical one, called by the Emperor *Justin*, in the year 553. to condemn the writings of *Theodorus Mopsuestia*, those of *Theodoret*, and the Epistles of *Ibas* to *Maris*; for this Council solicited *Vigilius*, Bishop of *Rome*, to judge the Question which they were handling, not separately from them, but conjointly with them: And the Emperor *Justinian*, in his Letters to *Enrichius* of *Constantinople*, and to *Apollinaris* of *Alexandria*, declares, That the care of Emperors hath always been to extirpate Heresies, and to preserve the purity of the Faith by the means of Councils; which sheweth clear enough, what superior Judge was acknowledged in the Church: I might joyn to the Authority of this 5th Oecumenical Council, that of the 6th and 7th, which make but one, this last having only added some Canons to the decisions of the sixth, which was held under *Constantine Pogonatus*, in the Palace called *Trullum*; since that, in the 36th Canon of this last Council, were confirmed the Canons of *Constantinople* and of *Chalcedon*, which made the Bishops of *Rome* and of *Constantinople* equal in Ecclesiastical Affairs; and condemned *Honorius*, Bishop of *Rome*, with many others, as tainted with the Heresy of the *Monotholites*; but our Discourse hath already been so long, that I ought not to tire out your patience any further.

Pbiler. I am not at all wearied with your Discourse; but it is not fit to exact too much upon your kindness, but to refer the other reflections which you can make upon this Subject, to another conversation.

The Third Dialogue.

P*Hilér.* You were so kind, my dear *Philalethe*, in our last walk, to make me hope for some more of your reflections upon the subject whereon we were discoursing. Ple be obliged to you if you will impart them to me now.

Phila. I will pursue this matter since you desire it ; but you will not take it amiss if I abridg it as much as I can. After the Authority and Judgment of Oecumenical Councils, I see nothing of greater force than what passed in the *African Councils*, and namely in the *Milevitan Council* held in the Month of *August* of the year 402, wherein *St. Austin* assisted, as appeareth in his 117th. Epistle : In this Council they confirmed what had been decreed against the *Donatists* by a former Council of *Carthage* ; and in the Sixth Council of *Carthage*, which was the *Univèsal of Africa*, begun in the year 418, and continued to the year 423. In the first of these Councils they made a Canon, which is the 22, or the 31 according to *Bal-zamon*, by which it was Ordained that Priests, Deacons, and other Clergymen should appeal from the Judgment of their Bishops to the other Neighbouring Bishops, and from them to the Council of *Africa*, or to the Primate, and to no other upon pain of Excommunication, as it hath been Ordained heretofore concerning Bishops. You may see it thus expressed in the *Greek Copies* in *Zonaras*, and in some *Latin Copies*, and in the Council of *Rheims* held under *Hugh Capet* where this *Milevitan Council* is alledged. It is true that * *Gratian* excepts * 1 *Caus. 2. qu.* Appeals to the See of *Rome* ; but that was added of his own 6. head, since it was Appeals themselves which these Fathers did design wholly to prohibit. In the second of these Councils, which is the Sixth of *Carthage*, composed of 207 Bishops, of whose number was *St. Augustin*, and wherein presided *Aurelius* Bishop of *Carthage*, they again had reason to renew this Decree against Appeals beyond Sea ; and see here the occasion : *Apiarius* Presbyter of *Sicca* in *Numidia*, was Deposed and Ex-

communicated for his Crimes by some Bishops; he Appealed from their Sentences before the Pope *Zosimus*, who by the judgment that he gave declared him innocent, and delivered him from the Penalties to which he had been condemned. This *Apiarius* having acknowledged his fault before the Council, and there asked pardon for it, was restored to the Exercise of his Charge, but not in the Church of *Sicca*, by reason of the Scandal he had there given. This wretched fellow falling again into his Disorders, was Deposed by *Sylvanus* his Bishop. He Appealed again from this Judgment to *Celestin*, who then held the See of *Rome*. The Pope sent the Bishop *Faustinus* to the Council, with two Presbyters, to maintain these the Rights of his See. *Faustinus* acquitted himself very well in his Commission: He represented that by virtue of the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, it was allowable to Appeal to the See of *Rome*, and demanded that the *Milevitan* Canon should be annulled, which prohibited Appeals beyond the Seas. The Bishops being surprized upon what *Faustinus* had said, because he cited a Canon wholly unknown to them, consulted the Copy of the Acts of the Council of *Nice*. The procedure in the Affair of *Apiarius* having been lawfully done, they confirmed the condemnation from which he had Appealed, and wrote a Synodical Letter to *Celestin*, which was Superscribed in these Terms, *To our most Dear and Honourable Brother Celestin*. And in this Letter they desire him not to receive to his Communion those whom they should Excommunicate, according to the Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, which have subjected as well inferior Clergymen as Bishops to their Metropolitans, willing that Affairs should be determined where they began; assuring themselves that the Grace of the Holy Spirit would never be wanting to every Province; and after having shewed him the inconveniencies that would follow these sorts of Appeals, they give him to understand that they had not found in the Acts of the Council of *Nice* which had been sent them from *Constantinople*, and from *Antioch*, this Canon which *Faustinus* had alledged. Not satisfied with this Letter which contained their Opinions, they make a Canon which renewed that of the *Milevitan* Council, signifying that Priests, Deacons, and other inferior Clergymen should not Appeal beyond the Seas, but

but to the Primate of their Provinces, as hath been often resolved concerning Bishops. Who is there now but seeth that the Fathers of this Council did not believe that the Bishop of Rome had the Supreme Authority in the Church, since that not only his Legate *Faustinus* did not preside in it, but was seated after *Valentinus* Bishop of the first See of *Numidia*; that they examined over again the Affair of *Apiarius*, as though it had not been judged by the Bishop of Rome; that they give him only the name of Brother, and will not at all permit that any Clergyman of *Africa* should appeal to Rome?

Philér. This indeed appears very strong; but do not you know that it is generally agreed, that in the *Milevitan* Canon, there is nothing said of the Bishops? and that the clause that concerns them hath been since added? that besides the Canon produced by *Faustinus* to his Colleagues, was in some respects a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, since that it was of the Council of *Sardica*, which is but an Addition, a Supplement, and as it were the Seal of the Council of *Nice*?

Phila. These Interpretations appear to me but weak; for the *Milevitan* Canon in the Greek, and in some Latin Copies, doth comprehend the Clause concerning Bishops. Besides, the Fathers of this Council of *Africa*, in the Epistle which they wrote to *Celestin*, make it known sufficiently that they did not understand that Bishops could appeal beyond the Seas, no more than other inferior Clerks, seeing that at the same time which they wrote this Epistle, they had before them not only the Appeal of *Apiarius*, but also that which *Anthony* Bishop of *Fossat* had brought against the Sentence of his Provincial Synod before the Pope *Boniface* who restored him; for which reason † † Epist. 162. St. *Augustin* wrote a Letter to *Celestin*, this Popes Successor, concerning these pretended Additions to the Council of *Nice*; for that of *Sardica* was called by different Emperors, in a far distant place, and after a considerable Interval of time; for Motives and Reasons also different, as every body knoweth that hath any knowledge of History. If this Council had been a Supplement of the Council of *Nice*, as they pretend, why is it not placed in the order of Oecumenical Councils? Whence comes it that the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage*, amongst whom were St. *Augustin*, *Aserelius*, and *Alipandus*, the most famous Bishops of their time, were ignorant of this Canon?

And why did not *Faustinus* say plainly, that this Canon was truly of the Council of *Sardica*, rather than that it was of equal authority to the Council of *Nice*, to which it was but the Supplement and the Seal?

I will not enlarge to you upon what passed in the year 397, in the Council of *Turin*, where they judged the difference that was between *Proclus* Bishop of *Marseilles*, and Metropolitan of the first Province of *Narbonne*, and the Bishops of the second Province, who would not depend upon him; and the contest that there was between the Bishops of *Arles* and of *Vienne*, concerning the honour of Primacy, and the right of Ordination; which the Fathers of this Council would not have dared to undertake, had they believed that the Sovereign Authority had belonged to the Bishop of *Rome*. You may learn the same thing from what passed in the Council of *Toledo*, against the *Priscilianists*, and of the conjunction which these Fathers make of *Ambrose* Bishop of *Milan*, and of *Siricus* Bishop of *Rome*. Nor will I entertain you with the Council of *Francfort*, called by the Emperor *Charlemagne* in the year 794, wherein assisted the Bishops of *France*, of *Germany*, and of *Italy*, whither the Pope *Adrian* sent his Legates, and wherein the Canon of the second Council of *Nice* concerning the Religious Worship of Images was annulled, though this Council had been approved of by *Adrian*. I will not speak to you neither of the Councils which were held in *France* our own Country, which vigorously opposed this immoderate Worship which the second Council of *Nice* would have established, and which the Popes maintained to their utmost. In good faith now, if the Fathers of the Council of *Francfort*, or if the Prelates of *France* had believed the See of *Rome* to be Sovereign, would they have spoken, would they have acted as they did?

I come now to the Council of *Constance* held in the year 1414. whose Authority and Decision my Lords the Bishops make use of to support their opinion. He that will penetrate well into the spirit of this Council, must take the thing in its original, and observe that a lamentable Schism had raged near 30 years, and produced a great many evil effects during the Pontificate of *Peter de Luna*, called *Benedict* the 13th. and under that of *Angelus Corrarius*, called *Gregory* the 12th, Anti-popes; the Cardinals of either party being Assembled, agreed for the

putting an end to these Schisms, to call a Council at *Pisa*. This Council being Assembled in the year 1409. declares, That this Affair belonged to them, as they represent.d the Universal Church, and they condemned *Peter de Luna*, and *Angelus Corrarus*, as notorious Schismatics, defenders and favourers of Schism, Hereticks, and as having deviated from the Faith, &c. After the deposing of these two Anti-popes by the Council, the Cardinals who there assisted, chose *Peter de Candia* Pope, who was called *Alexander* the 5th, and who lived but about Ten months: After his death the same Cardinals elected the Cardinal *Balthasar* of *St. Eustace*, who called himself *John* the 23. or 24. Thus there were three Anti-popes who condemned one another. To find out a remedy for this disorder, the Emperor *Sigismund* advised Pope *John*, to order that the Council of *Pisa* should be continued in the City of *Constance*, whereupon this Pope called thither all those that had a deliberative voice, the Emperor, and all Christian Princes. Pope *John* opened the Assembly in the Emperors presence; and in the second Session he would have renounced the Papacy, provided his competitors would do the same; but they refusing, they were all three judged and condemned by the Council, Pope *John* for many crimes whereof he was accused and convicted, and the others for the same reasons that they had been condemned at *Pisa*; and they chose *Odo Colonna* Pope, who called himself *Martin* the 3d or the 5th; And to the end that no man might doubt of the power which the Council had of Judging Sovereignly in all Ecclesiastical Affairs, they, in their 4th Session, made this following Canon:

The General Council lawfully Assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost, and representing the Catholick Church militant, holdeth immediately its power from Jesus Christ; to which Council, all manner of Persons of what estate or quality soever, nay the Pope himself, is bound to obey in things which concern the Faith, the extirpation of Schisms, and the General Reformation of the Head and Members.

And for as much as in the 39th Session this Council did ordain, that for time to come there should be held a General Council at the end of every Ten years, and that the next Council should be called in Five years, and the following one in Seven, the Council accordingly was called together at *Pavia*, where it began, and was afterward continued at *Siena*, and finally in 1431. it was transferred to *Basil*, where it was decided according to

the Council of *Constance*, that it was a most Catholick truth, that Councils were above Popes, and that Popes could not by their own wills either dissolve, or prorogue Councils from place to place.

P. Have you no other proof which justifieth this Opinion? And have not there been Popes who have acknowledged the superiority of Councils?

Phil. There are many other proofs which might be made use of, which are even of the same kind as those whereof we have already spoken; for we might remember several examples of the Ancient Bishops of *Rome*, who have suffered their judgments to be examined in General Councils; and have submitted themselves to their Decrees; nay there are some who have desired that the Decrees which they had made might be examined in Council; and amongst others, *Leo* the Great, who demanded of *Theodosius*, that what he had decreed, as well as what had been decreed in the pretended Council of *Ephesus*, should be examin'd in a Gen. Council. There have been also many other Popes that have acknowledged the Tribunal of particular Councils, and amongst others the Pope *Damasus*, who disputing with *Ursicinus* concerning the Pontificate, submits himself to the judgment of a Synod, which decided this Affair; and when this Pope was accused of Adultery by two Deacons, *Concordius* and *Castorius*, he justified himself before a Council of 44 Bps, Assembled at *Rome*, in the year 378. I could add the evidence of several Popes upon this subject, and amongst others, that of *Zozimus*, who, in his 1st. Ep. says, That the Authority of his See cannot add nor change any thing against the Ordinances of the Holy Fathers, which is a mark of subjection, and of dependence. And also that of *Gregory* the Great, who, in some place, protested that he revered the Authority of the four Great Councils, like that of the four Gospels.

Philér. Were I not afraid of trespassing upon your patience, I would desire you to give me some particular account of our *Gallican* Church, and to let me know, whether she always believed the Superiority of the Councils above the Popes?

Phila. I will do it, my dear *Philérène*; but it shall be but very short, that I may not tire you. It cannot be doubted but that in the first Centuries, our Churches of *France* acknowledged the Authority of Councils as superior to all others, since that in the question concerning the day of Celebrating *Easter*, our Prelates without the knowledg and participation of the Pope, called a Synod, wherein *St. Irenæus* presided, who by order of the Synod wrote a Letter, extremely pressing, to Pope *Victor* about this Affair, as may be seen in *Eusebius*; which this Bishop would never dare to have done, if the Pope had been considered in the *Gallican* Church as the Supreme Magistrate of the Church; and the Decretal Epistles attributed to the first Bishops of *Rome*, cannot be objected to the contrary, because that these Epistles have such visible characters of being counterfeited, that it is beyond all doubt. And in the Council of *Arles*, above mentioned, our Bishops of *France* shewed sufficiently that the Pope was subject to the Authority of Councils, since that they examined an Appeal brought before them from the Popes Sentence. Since that time divers Synods have been held in *France* by the order and permission of our Kings, to treat of things concerning the Faith or Discipline of the Church, wherein they judged of Faith by the Oracles of the Scripture, and by Tradition; and of Discipline

by the Canons of the Church, that is to say of Councils. Such was, for example, that which was held in the reign of our K. *Clovis* at *Orleance*, &c.

Also the second Council of *Mafcon* Ordained, that Provincial Councils should be called by the Metropolitans, and that of the whole Kingdom by the Bishop of *Lions*, with the Kings permission. It is true, that the *Gallican* Church received a great abridgment of its Liberties in the year 445, by the Ordinance of *Valentinian* the 3^d, who made the judgments of all the *French* Prelates subject to the Pope. But this Ordinance of *Valentinian* received divers oppositions in *France*, as it were easie to justify by many famous examples. In the 8. Century the Churches of *France* received another blow, by introducing the Code of the *Roman* Canons, which *Charlemaign* obliged himself to receive in *France*, as well as the *Roman* Office, in acknowledgment of the good turns which Po. *Adrian* had done him, who in an Assembly of 15 Bishops, and many Abbots declared *Charlemaign* *Patrician*, or a Nobleman of *Rome*, and acknowledged that it was in his power to Elect Popes, to regulate the Apostolick See, to institute through all the Provinces Archbishops and Bishops; in a word he invested him with all the Rights which the *Roman* Emperors enjoyed: Nevertheless this great Prince found in the execution of his promise great opposition from the Clergy whom he forced to receive the Code of these aforesaid Canons by constraint, *Minis & Suppliciis*, says the Original; nor were these Canons received but by the Authority of our Kings, having been published but under the name of *Charlemaign*, and as Ordinances made by him. His Successors have trod in the same footsteps, always ordering that the Laws which they made by the advice of the Prelates of their Kingdoms, and which are to be read in their *Capitulars* should be published under their Majesties Names, and that the Popes themselves should be subject to them. *C. de Capi. & distin.* 10. and *C. nos de Compet.* 2. *Quest.* 7. But whatever increase the Authority of the Pope had gained in *France* by this Ordinance of *Valentinian*, and by this Introduction of *Charlemaign*, this did not hinder our Bishops from shewing upon all occasions a great deal of vigor in maintaining their Privileges, and the Authority of the Church. It is manifest by divers Examples which History affordeth, and chiefly by that of *Hincmare* B. of *Laon*; this Prelate was censured and condemned for his ill actions by a Synod held at *Vervins*; he would have appealed to *Rome*, but far from having any regard to his appeal he was forthwith condemned for his disobedience, in a Synod of ten Provinces held at *Attini*. We may add to this example of *Hincmare*, that of *Arnulph* A.B. of *Rheims*, who was condemned and deposed for several crimes in an Assembly of many Bishops held at *Rheims*, who declared that they acted by the Authority which had been given to the Apostles, and which had been left to them. This sufficiently sheweth that an Apostolick spirit reigned in the souls of our Prelates, and that in spite of the enterprizes and attempts of the Court of *Rome*, they maintained this general opinion of their worthy Predecessors, That they held their charges and the authority which belongeth to them from God, and not from the See of *Rome*. They shewed the same zeal in the A.B. of *Sens* his Affair at the Synod of *Pontignon*, and in that of *Saire*, concerning a Church in the Diocess of *Tours*, held by a Cardinal sent

sent by *John* the 20. which they call a Sacriledg and a contradiction to the Holy Canons which ordain that a Bishop can do nothing in anothers Diocess without his consent. And in that of *Geofry* Bishop of *Chartres*, in whose place one *Ivo* had been surrogated by Pope *Urban* 2d, whom *Richarius* A B. of *Sens*, Metropolitan of *Chartres*, together with the Bishops of *Paris*, *Troys*, and *Meaux*. opposed. They also shewed this same spirit in the advice they gave to *Philip* the *August*, to appeal to the next Council from the Sentence of *Innocent* 3, as from an abuse, in the Pragmatick Sanction which *St. Lewis* made by their advice; and in the Council which they gave together with others assembled at *Paris* in the year 1209 to *Philip* the Fair against the enterprizes of *Boniface* 8, not to mention the famous Book call'd *Somnium Viridarii*, writ and published by the order of *Charles* the Fifth, called the *Wise*; nor of the Laws and Rules which *Charles* the 6. his Son, made against the Usurpations of the Court of *Rome*, which sheweth sufficiently that the Authority of the See of *Rome* was not looked upon as the superior Authority in *France*.

But after that the Council of *Constance* had formally explained it self upon this matter, men spoke bolder in *France* than they had done in former times. *Charles* 7th. forbad the French Prelates to go to the Council called at *Ferrara* in the year 1427. And he himself called in the City of *Bourges* a great and famous Assembly of the Princes of his Blood, Officers of his Crown, Prelates and Ecclesiastical persons, members of his great Council, Doctors in Law, as well Divine as Humane, and Professors of the Universities, together with the Legates of *Eugenius* 4th. After that the Doctors of the Universities had represented in the name of the whole *Gallican* Church, her former state, her Rights, and the attempts which had been made upon her Liberties; they besought his Majesty to remedy this disorder, that he would be pleased to Authorize some Decrees and Canons of the General Councils of *Constance* and of *Basil*, such as that is which declares, that General Councils lawfully assembled, and representing the Church militant, have their power immediately from *Jes. Christ*, and are above the Pope, which Councils they themselves had judged ought to be observed. Whereupon the King approved & confirmed the aforesaid decrees & ordered all people to observe and keep them inviolably. This is that which was called the pragmatick Sanction; 2 years afterwards *Lewis* 11. being won by the flatteries of *Pius* 2d, and through evil suggestions, as may be seen in the Book of the three Estates of the year 1483, revoked the Pragmatick Sanction without any consultation of the States before hand, or of the *Gallican* Church. The Kings Attorney General, and the Rector of the University of *Paris* formally opposed the Registring the Kings Letters concerning these his Decrees. The Court of Parliament it self represented in writing the great evils that would happen upon the abolishing of so just a Sanction, to so good effect, that *Lewis* 11th far from abolishing it, gave orders for its confirmation, as amongst others that of the 16 of *August* 1478, whereby it is forbidden to go to *Rome* to seek after any Benefice, or to pay in any money, upon pain of Confiscation of Body and Goods; and to prevent *Anathemas* from *Rome*, he caused his Parliament of *Paris* at the request of his Attorney-General to pass an Act, that in case the Pope should undertake any

any thing to the prejudice of his Ordinances, he should appeal to the next Council.

The Estates of the Kingdom, whereof the Clergy is the first Order, being Assembled at *Tours*, present a Petition to King *Charles* the 8th, in the first Article of which, they desire His Majesty to keep, and maintain inviolably the Pragmatick Sanction of *Bourges*, founded upon the Decrees of the Councils of *Constance* and of *Basil*. And in the National Council, which *Lewis* the 12th Assembled in the same City of *Tours*, in the year 1510, the observation of the Pragmatick Sanction was fully resolved upon. Observe how our venerable Prelates have ever maintained the Interest and the Privileges of the Church, against the attempts of the Court of *Rome*, and how they make appear to the whole World, that they do Religiously keep in their hearts the Sentiments which they had received from their Ancestors, & that they believed that the supreme Authority reside in General Councils; and that how eminent soever that of the See of *Rome* might be, it was still dependant upon theirs. This is the Doctrine which hath been taught and maintained by the University of *Paris*, as may be seen in the Writings of her most famous Doctors, such as are the Chancellor (c) *Gerson James Almain*, &c. to which you may add a great many more, as (d) the Cardinal of *Cambray*, *Nicho*, *Cusan*, (e) the Abbot *Panormitan*, (f) *Abulensis*, (g) *Franciscus de Victoria*, (h) *Alphonsus a Castro*, and all the Divines of the Council of *Trent*, which is spoken of in the 7th Book of the History of this Council, who maintained with our Bishops of *France*, and those of *Spain*, that the jurisdiction of Bishops, and their confidence was of Divine Right.

Philer. All that you have said, perswades me sufficiently, that the Authority of Councils is above that of the Popes; but there are some scruples that I desire to be resolved in, before that I can cordially embrace your Opinion; These scruples arise from two things wherein you will agree with me. The one is, That the Popes have been ever desired to confirm Councils, which without doubt had never been, if their Authority had not depended on that of the Popes. And the other is, That the Title of Head of the Council is given to the Pope, and namely in the second Councils of *Ephesus* and of *Chalcedon*.

Phila. What you say cannot be disproved, but I think that the consequences that you draw from these Principles are not right; for you must in the first place acknowledg that the consent to, and confirmation of General Councils, was desired of all great Sees, which did not regard the Decrees of Councils as Obligatory, till after they had themselves consented to them. Thus the Decree of the Council of *Ephesus* against *Nestorius*, was of no force in the East, till that *John* of *Antioch*, and all the Metropolitans depending upon his Diocess had agreed to it; And the judgment of the 5th General Council against the *Tria Capitula*, was without force till the Diocesses of *Africa*, *France*, *Spain*, and of *Ibryicum* had confirmed it; not that the confirmation and consent demanded by General Councils of Great Sees, besides that of *Rome*, did infer that the Councils did depend upon these Sees, as all men do agree. Nor can you infer, That the Councils did depend upon the Pope, upon pretence that they demanded his consent and confirmation to their Decrees.

(c) Tract. de potest. Eccles.
(d) Nic. Cus. de concord. can. lib. 2. cap. 2.
(e) Pan. in cap. signif. extrav. de elect.
(f) Abulensis in cap. 18. Matt. quæst. 103.
(g) Fran. vict. T. de potes. Eccles.
(h) Alph. a Cast. lib. 7. de just. pun. hæc.

You.

* Conc. Toled.
cap. 2. lib. 1.

You may add to this, That Superiors have many times desired their Inferiors to confirm their Acts; The Council of *Sardica* desired all the Churches to whom they send their Synodal Epistle, That they would confirm what they had Decreed. The 15th Council of *Toledo* confirmed the Decrees of the 6th General Council, at the request of *Leo* * the 2d. *Pelagius* the first desired his Clergy to confirm his demand concerning Ordinations. *Julian*, Bishop of *Cales*, the Popes Legate at the Council of *Chalcedon*, says, in his Letters to the Emperor *Leon*, That this Prince had commanded all Bps that they should confirm the Doctrines of the Holy Apostles; and in the year 465, the Prelates of the 3^d Province of *Lyons*, being Assembled at *Rennes*, under *Perpetuus* Metropolitan of *Tours*, sent their Decrees to *Victorius* and *Thalassius* of *Angiers*, who were not present, that by their Authorities they might confirm them; which clearly proves, that the confirmation of the Decrees of Councils by the Popes, is not a mark of the Popes superiority over Councils. Now for the quality of Head, which was given to the Pope in the Councils of *Ephesus* and of *Chalcedon*, as you have observed, besides that they were his own Legates that gave him this Title in the Council of *Ephesus*, Act 2. and that *St. Cyril* of *Alexandria*, and *Juvenal* of *Jerusalem* presiding, the Council sufficiently shewed that they did not own the Pope as the Sovereign Head of the Church; I say, that this quality of Head carried with it no preheminance of Magistracy and of Dominion, but only a preheminance of Order, of Direction, and of Excellence. And it is in this sense that *Gregory Nyssen* said in the second General Council, That by the death of *Meletius*, the Council had lost its Head; and there is nothing more ordinary among Authors, whether they treat of Politick or Ecclesiastical Affairs, than to give the Title of Head and Chief to them who preside in Societies. It is in this sense that the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* give Pope *Leo*; who there presided in the person of his Legates, the name of Head of this Council, according to the Order of the Emperor *Martianus*. Besides, if the Title of Head, in matters of Faith and of Religion, hath been given to some Prelates, as to *Nicephorus* Bishop of *Constantinople*, to the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, to *St. Athanasius*, to *St. Basil*, to *Nicetius* Bp of *Treves*, to *Gregory* of *Tours*, and some others, by reason of the Eminence of their Sees, or because of their Learning, of their Piety, and of their good Conduct; With how much more justice may the Bp. of *Rome* have been honoured with it, he who was, not only the Metropolitan of some Bps, or the Exarch of a Diocese composed of Ten Provinces, but who, to speak with * *Theodorus Studita*, was the first of the whole Body of the Church, and who occupied the first See of all Christendom, and the See which was esteemed the most eminent, either because it had been occupied by *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, two the most famous of the Apostles, the first of which is called, even by the Holy Fathers, the Prince of the Society of the Apostles; or because it was established in a City, wherein resided the Majesty of the whole *Roman* Empire, and which was the Capital City of the World?

* Epist. 52.

Phil r. I am fully satisfied, and thank you for the kindness you have shewed in discoursing with me so long upon this matter, I now perceive the Truth and the importance of it; and I profess my self, without more ado, to be of your opinion; but it is time for us to think of retiring.

F I N I S.